

THE AMERICAN

A NATIONAL JOURNAL

VOL. XXVI—No. 660

PHILADELPHIA, SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1897

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE AMERICAN.

A NATIONAL JOURNAL.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY ON EACH SATURDAY.

[Entered at the Post Office at Philadelphia as matter of the second class.]

BARKER PUBLISHING COMPANY, PROPRIETORS.
WHARTON BARKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICES,
Rooms 24 and 26
Forrest Building, No. 119 South Fourth Street, Philadelphia.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND ADVERTISING.

Subscription, \$2.00 per annum. Subscribers must notify us when they wish to discontinue.

Advertising rates for short or long time furnished on application.

Specimen copies sent on application.

A copy will be sent free to each advertiser during the continuance of his advertisement.

CHECKS, POSTAL ORDERS, ETC., should be drawn to order of BARKER PUBLISHING COMPANY.

*Address through Post Office: THE AMERICAN, Box 1202, Philadelphia.

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE.

	PAGE
Notes of the Week	193
EDITORIALS:	
The Tariff and the Trusts	197
An Anti-Trust Amendment	199
Tariff Reciprocity and Our Ocean Marine	201
Women's Ways	203
A Word With the Doctor	204
"Christianity and Idealism"	204
Book Reviews	205
About Books and Writers	206
Notes and Queries for Those Who Travel	208

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

MUCH in the dark as to changes in tariff rates, without the opportunity of a careful comparison of the schedules of the Dingley bill with those of the Wilson and McKinley tariffs, and with but a meager comprehension of the general scope of the tariff measure prepared by the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee of the Fifty-fourth Congress and now submitted to the Fifty-fifth, the House draws near to the day fixed for voting upon this measure. But little pains have been taken to shed light on the measure. The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, who have spent three months over the preparation of the bill, have alone had the time to gain a comprehensive idea of its scope. That they have gained such an idea is not apparent. If they have gathered a thorough understanding of the measure they have kept it carefully locked up within themselves. That the House is groping blindly troubles them not at all; they evince no disposition to throw light on the details of the bill; they seem to be imbued with but the one desire—the desire of hurrying the bill along, and they wait impatiently for the day on which they can call upon Republicans

to align themselves in support of the bill. Perhaps the Republican leaders are thus indifferent as to whether or not the bill is comprehended in this, its initial stage, because they feel that the bill now being pushed through the House will bear no resemblance to the tariff measure that will be finally passed, if any tariff measure is passed, and put on the statute books by the Fifty-fifth Congress.

However this may be, Mr. Dingley has not greatly aided the House to an understanding of his tariff measure. The report that he presented to the House along with the tariff bill leaves much to be desired. He sets out to give us but a glance at the scope of the measure. He tells us the Government, confronted with deficits in revenues, is short of money, and that additional revenue is imperatively demanded; he tells us the aim of the committee in framing the measure has been to so adjust duties as to secure the needed increase in revenues, and at the same time extend protection to our manufacturers against European competition. The suggestion that the imposition of tariff duties high enough to protect our manufacturers from foreign competition would result in a repression of imports and consequent curtailment in revenues derived from such schedules, he dismisses with a wave of his hand. He further tells us that the wool and woolen schedules, the agricultural, the silk and the earthenware and glass schedules are substantially the same as in the McKinley tariff, that the cotton and metal schedules are in large part the same as in the present tariff, and that the other schedules have been revised so as to put the rate of duties betwixt and between the rates of the Wilson and McKinley tariffs. We are also told that, for purposes of revenue, the duties on sugar, both raw and refined, have been raised; that provision is made for the extension of the policy of reciprocity, and he winds up by an estimate of the probable revenue yield of the bill. With such a superficial explanation of the needs, the purposes and the changes of tariff rates contemplated, Mr. Dingley rests content.

BUT as superficial as is the report accompanying the Dingley tariff, as superficial as have been Mr. Dingley's explanations, in writing and by speech, objections to the premises he lays down, and questions as to the correctness of his bold assumptions, crop out. In the first place, Mr. Dingley builds on a need for more revenue that does not exist. He has to admit that there is a cash balance in the Treasury of \$218,000,000, and as he cannot figure out the deficit in revenues against which he would provide, at much more than \$50,000,000 a year, it is clear this cash balance would last the Government some years. But having built his whole tariff scheme on the assumption that the Government is short of money—though there is a balance in the Treasury of \$218,000,000—and that more revenue is imperatively needed to enable the Government to meet its running expenses—though there is a surplus in the Treasury, beyond the gold reserve, sufficient to make good any probable deficits in revenues for the better part of two years at least—Mr. Dingley sets about figuring down this cash balance. He has to figure it down somehow to show that the Government is in need of money, for if the Government

is not short of money, his excuse for raising more revenue, at this time, falls to the ground. So he deducts from the balance in the Treasury some \$20,000,000 of fractional silver and minor coin. Still this leaves him with a balance of \$196,000,000. He calculates that it will take \$16,000,000 of this to cover the deficits in revenues prior to July 1st next, but even this leaves a prospective cash balance of \$180,000,000, or a balance of \$80,000,000 over and above the sum of gold set aside as a greenback redemption fund.

So Mr. Dingley has to stretch a point. He declares that \$150,000,000 of gold should be held in the Treasury as a redemption fund instead of \$100,000,000; he tells us, that of the balance now in the Treasury \$150,000,000 is gold, and that none of this gold should be touched to meet the expenses of the Government. In this way he gets down the working balance in the Treasury that he estimates will be available on July 1st next to \$30,000,000, and on this estimate rests the need of additional revenue.

But what excuse is there for permanently locking up \$150,000,000 of gold in the Treasury? The excuse for maintaining a reserve of \$100,000,000 is slim enough, the maintenance of such a reserve is not directed by law, and the existence of such a reserve is only once mentioned in our statutes, the Secretary of the Treasury being directed to suspend the issue of gold certificates when the gold reserve in the Treasury, available for redemptions, falls below \$100,000,000. Now, Mr. Carlisle took it upon himself to suspend the issue of gold certificates altogether, thus treating as a dead letter the statute authorizing the issue of such certificates when the gold reserve in the Treasury was not less than \$100,000,000. Nor has Mr. Gage directed the issue of gold certificates against deposits of gold, though there are now over \$150,000,000 of gold in the Treasury. So, the only statute which makes mention of a gold reserve being treated as a dead letter, it must be admitted the excuse for maintaining a gold reserve of \$100,000,000 is very slim. And warrant for locking up \$150,000,000 of gold in our Treasury vaults there is absolutely none. Such a proceeding would be but one further step to facilitate the contraction of our currency by piling up money in the treasury. It would be the taking of \$50,000,000 more out of circulation for good, and it is not the place of the Executive branch of the Government to engineer such a scheme of contraction without consulting Congress. Before contracting our currency by a block of \$50,000,000 the people who will be injuriously affected by such contraction are entitled to be consulted through their representatives.

It is true that the increasing of the gold reserve now held for redemptions by adding to it \$50,000,000 of gold now in the Treasury would not lead directly to any contraction, but indirectly it would, for it would bring us that much nearer a bond issue.

THERE is, then, no warrant for locking up \$150,000,000 of gold permanently in the Treasury, and Mr. Dingley has no excuse for cutting down the working cash balance in the Treasury in this way. The working cash balance in the Treasury on July 1st next, that Mr. Dingley estimates at but \$30,000,000, will then be at least \$80,000,000, and this after putting aside a gold reserve of \$100,000,000, deducting \$20,000,000 as unavailable fractional silver coin, and allowing for the payment away, during the next three months, of \$16,000,000 to meet an estimated deficit. And so it is that instead of being short of money the Government is in no need of money and will be in no need of more money than yielded by the revenue laws now in force for more than a year to come, assuming that the present rate of deficiency in revenues will continue. There is, then, no imperative demand for the passage of the Dingley tariff or any other revenue measure.

And now a word to the purposes Mr. Dingley explains he and his committee had in view in framing the tariff measure now before the House. The purposes were two, to raise revenue and

to protect our manufacturers. Now, of course, the transfer of wool and some sundry other articles from the free to the dutiable list and the placing of increased duties on sugar can be counted upon to increase revenues, for no serious diminution in imports of sugar would be likely to follow an increase of duties and imposition of tariff duties on articles now on the free list can not fail to lead to some increase of revenues, unless the putting of an import duty on such products should be absolutely prohibitory of importations. And this is not to be anticipated in wool or anything else. So, also, it is quite possible to impose duties high enough to repress imports of manufactured goods and protect our manufacturers, but to adjust the duties on manufactured goods so as to both yield an increase of revenues and protect our manufacturers—and this we are told is one of the purposes of the Dingley bill—is next door to impossible, for we cannot protect our manufacturers against foreign competition without building duties high enough to at least repress imports of foreign goods, and to repress the volume of imports is to reduce the bulk of goods on which customs can be collected. Now, it is conceivable that higher rates of duty collected on a smaller bulk of goods would lead to an increase of revenues, and if the rate of duties could be so adjusted as to accomplish this, revenues might be increased while at the same time extending a measure of protection to manufacturers. But the adjusting of duties in this way would give but partial protection to manufacturers, it would protect our manufacturers from foreign competition only in a measure. To raise duties so as to extend thorough protection to manufacturers would of necessity cut off revenues, for such duties would be well nigh prohibitive of importations of foreign manufactured goods and leave nothing on which to collect duties. So it is reasonably certain that the tariff on importations of manufactured goods that results in an increased yield of revenues will not be satisfactory to manufacturers as a protective measure, and it is equally certain that a tariff satisfactory to our manufacturers will lead to a curtailment of revenues.

THE Wilson-Gorman tariff was reviled by friends and foes alike as the protector of trusts and combines, but if the tariff now on our statute books is considerate of trusts and combines, the Dingley bill is even more so. The rates of duty imposed on those articles, monopolized by domestic trusts and combines, have been left as they are or raised. And so would the Dingley tariff, if enacted in its present shape, put our consumers more under the thumb of trusts and combines than ever. These trusts and combines, organized to repress competition, having driven competitors to the wall and secured a monopoly of our markets, have made the tariff duties a shelter for their exactions. Protected from foreign competition by tariff duties, and suffering no domestic competition, they have been enabled to charge undue prices for their products, and now the Dingley tariff, instead of tearing down these trusts that have destroyed the purpose of protection, is framed so as to extend to them greater protection, and put in the hands of the trusts the power to increase their exactions.

Framing the tariff in this way, Mr. Dingley has laid himself and his tariff open to the trenchant attacks of Mr. Bailey. "Every citizen of this Republic," runs the report of Mr. Bailey, submitted on behalf of the minority of the Ways and Means Committee, "is entitled to the full possession and enjoyment of all he can honestly earn, and we deny the right of Congress to make or enforce any regulation which requires one man to give any part of his honest earnings toward encouraging enterprise or increasing the fortune of another." "No man," continues the report, "would defend a system of taxation under which the Government first collected money, and afterward distributed it among its favorites," and then the report adds, "we are unable to perceive any difference in principle between a law which requires the Government to collect money and distribute it among protected indus-

tries, and a law which enables these industries to collect the money directly from the people."

Such is the kind of attack that the Dingley tariff lays the protective system open to, and how are we going to defend the protective system if it is made the protector of trusts and does, in fact, enable these trusts and combines to collect a tax, in the shape of exorbitant prices for their products, directly from our people. There is no defense for a tariff that is made the protector of special interests. It is not right to require one man to give up any part of his honest earnings to build up the fortune of another. And a true protective tariff will not do this, indeed it is aimed just in the opposite direction, aimed to prevent the foreign monopolist from building up fortunes by preying on the honest earnings of our people. In short, it is aimed to build up domestic competition, and reduce prices, not to build up domestic monopoly and raise prices. Yet it is undeniable that the Dingley tariff is framed so as to shelter domestic monopoly; it is undeniable that our tariff system holds out protection to those who, having crushed out domestic competition, have, under the shelter of tariff duties, charged the prices of monopoly, and it is this that has brought the protective system into disrepute.

MR. BAILEY also attacks the Dingley measure on the ground that it aims to increase the revenues of the Government beyond its needs. Thus he sets out by asserting that the Dingley bill is expected to raise \$113,000,000 of additional revenue; that the deficit of revenues for the last fiscal year was but \$25,000,000, and from this he concludes that "the bill will collect from the people \$90,000,000 annually above the requirements of our present extravagant and wasteful appropriations."

But though the point is well taken, the desire to present a striking case gets the better of Mr. Bailey, and he presents unfair comparisons such as can but detract from the force of his argument. It is true that on a basis of importations for the last fiscal year it is calculated the changes made in tariff rates by the Dingley bill would result in increasing the customs revenues by \$113,000,000. But Mr. Dingley does not look for a continuance of the same character of imports. He looks for a falling off in importations of wools and woolens, especially during the first year, and he estimates the increase of revenues for the first year under the new tariff at \$75,000,000 and thereafter at \$100,000,000. It is also true that the deficit in revenues for the fiscal year 1896 was but \$25,000,000, but the deficit for the present fiscal year will come to double this, and the average deficit for the past four years has been over \$50,000,000. So, to illustrate his point, Mr. Bailey should have taken the promised increased yield of revenues at \$100,000,000, and the deficit at \$50,000,000, instead of \$113,000,000 and \$25,000,000 respectively. In short, the Dingley bill, instead of providing an excess of revenues of \$90,000,000 a year, would provide an excess of \$50,000,000. Now, the collection of this smaller sum in excess of expenditures, and the consequent contraction of our currency by piling up such surplus in the Treasury, would be most unjustifiable and injurious, and reason enough in itself for radical amendment of the Dingley bill. The stretching of \$50,000,000 into \$90,000,000 only gives rise to doubts and questions and weakens the case. Exaggerations never pay. They ever come back to plague him who sets them afloat.

THE consensus of opinion seems to be that the Dingley bill will undergo a thorough overhauling when it gets to the Senate at the hands of Republican Senators. Moreover, there is every evidence that they will take their time in overhauling it. The measure was in the hands of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House for three months, there is a prospect that the Republican members of the Senate Finance Committee will keep it under consideration at least half as long. If they give it the thorough overhauling it deserves,

six weeks will be none too long. But the Republicans in the Senate will not have a monopoly of overhauling it. There will be a quite general overhauling of the bill on the floor of the Senate, if not in Committee, by those who are bent on seeing it amended, so as to free it from the taint of monopoly.

Yet we are told by the worthy correspondent of the *Philadelphia Press*, that "there will be a good deal of opposition to the bill in the Senate, and that unless the trusts can have their way, the passage of the bill in that body will be long delayed, even if it succeeds at all, of which there is no certainty at this time."

Now that there will be a good deal of opposition to the tariff bill in the Senate we do not doubt, but if we mistake not, the opposition will come from those resolved on stripping the trusts of all tariff protection, not from the advocates of the trusts, and we fancy that submission to the imperious demands of the trusts would do anything but hasten the passage of the bill through the Senate. If the bill passes the Senate, it will be because the trusts cannot have their way. It will never pass the Senate while the impress of the trusts is on the bill.

CONSISTENCY is a jewel that few can keep. We have recently heard much outcry on the part of manufacturers over the stocking up of our markets with foreign woolens in anticipation of the raising of tariff duties. This overstocking of woolens is, for the most part, an expectation rather than a reality, yet manufacturers are very sore at the importers who, importing or making preparations to import large stocks of woolen goods under the schedules of the Wilson tariff, threaten to deprive manufacturers of much of the advantage they hoped to reap from the passage of the Dingley tariff and the re-enactment of the McKinley rates of duties calculated to keep out foreign importations and enlarge the market for goods of our own manufacture. But even after the enactment of the Dingley tariff, presuming it will be passed in its present shape, the manufacturers can hope for no broadening of market until the stocks of foreign goods imported in anticipation are worked off. And even then though they might hope for a broadening of market they would not get it for it is impoverishment of their customers, not an inroad of foreign goods, that is primarily accountable for the curtailment in demand for their goods. Prosperity of our farmers and planters must come before our woolen manufacturers can experience true revival, and this prosperity of our agricultural classes will not come until we restore bimetalism.

But to come back to our manufacturers who decry against importations of woolen goods in anticipation of tariff changes. They feel the stocking up of our markets with foreign woolens to be a grievous wrong, yet they one and all are guilty of doing the same grievous injury to the wool grower that they declare the importer is doing to them. They are stocking up in wool in anticipation of the passage of the tariff bill, thus depriving the wool grower of a measure of his expected profits. It makes a wonderful difference where the shoe pinches. For importers to stock up with foreign woolens in anticipation of tariff legislation is a grievous wrong, for manufacturers to stock up with wool is legitimate business and wise forethought. This is the way it appears to the manufacturer.

THE bounty held out to Japanese and Chinese producers by gold-using peoples is beginning to be felt by manufacturers of some lines of goods, just as the bounty enjoyed by the Argentinian, Russian and Indian agriculturists, in the shape of a premium on gold, has been felt by our farmers for years. The cost of producing silks, jute rugs and sundry other articles in Japan and China is little if any greater than a decade, or two decades ago. And this cost is paid in a currency that has depreciated, as measured by gold, until the gold dollar that twenty-five years ago was the equivalent of a Mexican dollar, or a Japanese yen, is to-day worth two Mexican dollars or two Japanese yens. Yet the yen will go

to-day, approximately, as far in Japan, and the Mexican dollar in China as twenty odd years ago. The result is the Japanese and Chinese can sell their products for one half the price in gold that they could twenty-five years ago. Thus has the purchase price of Japanese and Chinese goods been reduced to our people, just as silver has fallen as measured in gold, and Oriental rugs and silks have found an ever broadening market to the injury of our manufacturers engaged in producing competitive goods.

And now these manufacturers ask for relief. They recognize the cause of the increasing competition, but want the courage to suggest the true relief, to wit, the removal of the cause that has led to the increased competition. Instead of asking for silver remonitization, they ask that tariff duties be built up to counteract the bounty enjoyed by the Oriental peoples in the shape of a premium on gold. So we find a committee of the Carpet Manufacturers of America, headed by Mr. Dornan, late President of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, on a pilgrimage to Washington, and this is part of their petition to the Ways and Means Committee:

"Oriental rugs are mostly imported from countries which are upon a depreciated currency basis, resulting in a much lessened cost to the importer and a consequent loss of revenue to the Government by the fact that the duty is assessed upon the gold cost, rather than on the natural price of the countries from which imported.

"Higher rates of duty than those fixed in the bill should therefore obtain in order to recoup the revenues thus lost, and also to protect the productions of the carpet manufacturers against the increased competition of such rugs.

"The same remarks apply to the importations of jute rugs, mats and carpets, and we ask for correspondingly higher rates on such goods."

Instead of asking for correspondingly higher rates of duties to offset the bounty on imports enjoyed by their competitors, they should have asked for the restoration of bimetallism.

THE figures of our foreign trade for the eight months of the fiscal year ending March 1st last are significant. We exported merchandise in excess of imports to the value of \$312,478,640, and an excess of exports of silver over imports to the value of \$21,838,241. So it appears we sold \$334,316,881 worth of merchandise and silver more than we bought. Now, how have we been paid for this great sum? Our net imports of gold during this period came to \$65,800,665. In other words, we were paid in gold \$65,800,665, which leaves a balance of \$268,516,216 for which we have received nothing tangible in payment. Now, what has become of this great sum? It is not owing us. We have used it all. But how? In payment of charges on our foreign debt, in settlement of the expenses of Americans abroad, and in settlement for services rendered us by foreign ship owners. The fact that this great sum put to our credit by exports of merchandise and silver in excess of imports has been absorbed in eight months, gives us an inkling as to the immensity of the tribute under which we are staggering, it gives silent evidence of the great proportions of our foreign debt, and conveys a warning of the danger that confronts us, a warning of bankruptcy, from which there is but one road of escape, that road being a cheapening of the dollar and an enhancement in prices for the products we send abroad and upon which we must rely for the payment of our indebtedness.

THE Supreme Court has handed down one of the most far-reaching decisions of recent years. It makes railroad pools and combines, trusts and monopolies of all kinds amenable to law. No longer can corporate greed fearlessly transgress the law or ruthlessly trample upon the rights of others. Combines and trusts that have grown up superior to law, grown up in the idea that might makes right, and that corporate greed could do no

wrong, have had a rude awakening to the fact that there is a power, long dormant though it has lain, that is superior to their own,—a power that they must obey, and that can stand between them and their prey, stand as the protector of the weak, see that no man's rights be infringed, see that all men are freed from the grasp of monopoly, that centralized capital be used to serve not oppress the industrious toilers of our broad land.

The decision of the Court, rendered by the barest majority, it is true, but from which there is no appeal, bears directly on railroad combines and pools organized to repress competition in freight rates. Indirectly it strikes at all trusts and combines organized to restrict production. The case before the Court was the United States *vs.* the Trans-Missouri Freight Association. The Court held that the purpose of this association was to restrict competition, that its effect was to restrain trade and competition, to the detriment of the public, and that under the Sherman Anti-Trust Law such combines are illegal. It happens that this association was dissolved before the rendering of the decision of the Court, but the decision of the Court is applicable to all traffic associations or railroad pools entered into with a view of repressing competition. These associations must now be dissolved. The penalty for entering into them is imprisonment, or fine, or both. So railroad managers must beware. They dare not, after this decision, enter into combines for the repression of competition with that impunity that has been their wont.

The purpose of putting the Anti-Trust law on our statute books was to secure to our people the fullest advantages growing out of competition. This law has been considered as something of a dead letter, and combines and trusts have acted on this belief. But the decision of the Supreme Court revivifies it and trusts and combines, the very organization of which constitutes a transgression of the law, may now look for its enforcement. That they will fight such enforcement by every known means goes without saying, for they will not surrender the profits of monopoly if they can help it. But to the men who have suffered from the exactions of trusts and combines the decision of the Supreme Court is one of hope and promise. They look for this great step towards emancipation from the grasp of monopoly to be followed by other steps in the same direction until monopoly is rooted out and the benefits of free competition, and the enjoyment of the fruits of honest toil secured to all men. The decision of the Supreme Court is doubly welcome in that it was unexpected.

THE disastrous floods in the Mississippi Valley, the loss of life and enormous destruction of property are looked upon quite generally as unpreventable visitations of Providence. But the truth is that man has done much to invite the scourge of flood. By the ruthless destruction of nature's preventatives to the rapid melting of the snows, by his careless tearing down of the reservoirs nature builds to minimize floods and equalize the flow of water in our rivers, he has multiplied the intensity of floods which are his scourge at one time, and of low water and drought from which he suffers at others.

Man is alone to blame for the well-authenticated facts that our rivers, of recent years, have swollen, at flood time, to greater proportions than they used to a generation and more ago, and that year after year a higher water-mark is recorded for our rivers. It is the destruction of our forests at the head-waters of our rivers that has caused the change in the flow of our rivers, caused higher water at some seasons and lower water at others than used to be recorded.

The shade of forests retards the melting of winter snows, and the spongy soil of the forest is a great absorbent of water. The snows melt, and instead of running off the waters are taken into the ground to feed the summer springs. It is thus that nature provided for equalizing the flow of rivers, provides against the extremes of high and low water from which we now suffer so

greatly. Destroying our forests we exposed the snows on our mountain slopes to the full rays of the sun, thus causing winter's snows to be melted very rapidly. And, melting rapidly, the opportunity for the absorption of the snow water into the earth has been curtailed. Besides, the spongy soil retained on a mountain's side by the roots of forest growth, and so absorbent of water, is washed off the hill slopes when the woods disappear. And so it is that there is nothing to retain water on the mountain sides, nothing to retard its running off. Consequently, the intensity of floods is multiplied, while the water that should be held in nature's reservoirs to feed the summer springs is not retained. Consequently, the summer springs go dry, and so we have low water in summer.

And as man has invited the scourge of flood he can do much to prevent the intensity of such visitations. He should keep our mountain slopes clothed with timber. And he could make the clothing of the mountain slopes a source of profit as well as safety. He could gather an ever-recurring crop of timber. All that man is required to do is to plant a sapling when he cuts a tree. Nature will do the rest and keep our mountain sides clothed with timber.

WHEREIN bloodshed by gloved fists differs in heinousness from bloodshed by weapons is an ethical riddle we leave to the skilled in such matters. Enough that our daily and Sunday papers have rushed to stain their sheets with gore, not for any liking for gore, but for all-blinding love of gain. The Shakespeare calendar motto for the day the papers incarnadined themselves with details of the fight for gold was a fine satire on the Carson spectacle:

"What a piece of work is a man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!"—*Hamlet* ii, 2.

A foxy animal when in his mission of running a paper on counting-house principles he reports the fight, somewhat briefly, but still reports it on one page, and on another calls on heaven and earth to witness his pious superiority to those wicked wretches who sell more papers by giving the same report somewhat amplified. The *Philadelphia Ledger's* baby came quite against the spirit and letter of its moral decalogue, but—"it was only a very little one, don't you know?"

SOME who judge the body of the sea by its surface are deeply disturbed because Mr. Gladstone has written one of his long letters on the Eastern Question, and two figure-heads who are certainly not the leaders of the disrupted Liberal party, have announced that maintenance of the Sultan is no longer to be a plank in the Liberal platform. How utterly meaningless these incidents are as factors in high politics will be more clearly seen every day from now until the next general election. They protest against the blockade of Crete and the repression of the noble Greek, who is burning to set the world afire that he may enjoy a bit of roast Turkey. Mr. Gladstone is a very old man, and this perhaps explains his remarkable forgetfulness of one stupendous fact in his statesmanly career, the fact that he did not hesitate to blockade the ports of Greece only eleven years ago, on the very ground that European war was a far greater evil than the maintenance of Turkey, and the threat of Greece to invade Macedonia was intended to create a general war.

APPEARANCES to the contrary notwithstanding, there is small reason for hysterics over the inflammatory despatches sensation-hunting correspondents send to the hungry newspapers. The unseen, unheard forces of all-compelling self-interest, otherwise known as patriotism, are making for a consummation which will ensure universal peace. Physical force has its moral mission

in the settling of all family troubles, from the nursery to the international council chamber. The English Liberal party have invariably—when out of office—voiced fine philanthropic sentiments and promises about putting down the Turk and exalting the noble Greece, and—when back in office—they have as invariably done the very opposite. Responsibility is a wonderful cure for wild or disingenuous politicianism. There is a small but not insignificant factor which makes for a rational settlement in the fact that the Turkish Ambassador in London, Costaki Pasha, is not a Turk but a Greek, not a Mohammedan but a Christian. He began as a professor of languages, the first Greek ever permitted to teach in a Moslem college. As a skilled lawyer he became a high magistrate, and then judge of the Supreme Court and life-senator. He has been head of the judiciary, Governor-General of Crete, and was entrusted with the work of general reform, and is a man of great capacity, honor and prudence.

THE TARIFF AND THE TRUSTS.

THE Republican party has come to the cross-roads of tariff policy. Within the year it came to the cross-roads of monetary policy, and it took the road leading to the exaltation of the idle few and the impoverishment of the many; it put its stamp of approval on a monetary system calculated to enable those who live not by the product of their own labor, but off the fruits of others' toil, to exact an ever increasing tribute from the producers of wealth. This the Republican party did at St. Louis, when, ignoring the evils of an appreciating dollar—ignoring the injustice of forcing debtors to pay their creditors in dollars of an ever increasing purchasing power, of forcing them to surrender to their creditors an ever increasing share of the products of their toil in satisfaction of their indebtedness—it pledged itself to the maintenance of the appreciating gold standard. By so doing the Republican party declared its purpose of depriving producers of an equality in the race for this world's goods, of an equality of chance to the production and enjoyment of wealth that is the inalienable right of all men.

To secure all men, whether of high or low degree, in the enjoyment of the fruits of honest toil, to see that all men have an equal chance to rise in this world, to see that no man shall have an advantage over his fellow other than that conferred by greater energy or capacity, is the prime duty of a government founded on the great truth that all men are and of right ought to be created free and equal. And so it is that the first duty of our Government is to insure to all men the fullest and freest enjoyment of the fruits of their toil that is commensurate with justice. But the Republican party in picking out its financial policy has gone in the opposite direction. It came to the cross-roads of financial policy, one leading to the establishment of a stable standard, of a dollar that would neither defraud the creditor nor rob the debtor, of a dollar calculated to insure all men in the enjoyment of the fruits of their toil; one leading to the maintenance of a dollar of ever increasing purchasing power as our measure of value, a dollar sure to reduce the share of the producer of wealth in this world's goods and to increase the share of the creditor, a dollar calculated to deprive producers of the fair enjoyment of the fruits of their toil to which they are entitled, and it chose the latter road, the road to class privileges, not equality.

And such being the course taken by the Republican party in monetary policy we can scarcely doubt that, having come to the cross-roads of tariff legislation, it will take the same course as to tariff policy. But because the party seems destined to take this course it does not follow that the individual members of the party in Congress and out will follow this course as a unit. We trust the Republican members of the House to stand up for true protection, for a protective measure considerate of the general weal, not of special interests, will not be few. We do not look for any revolt from the party whip at this initial stage; we look for the Republi-

cans in the House to vote solidly for the tariff as framed and amended by Mr. Dingley and send it to the Senate, but when it comes back from the Senate amended, as we believe it will be, so as to strip trusts and combinations designed to repress competition of protection, we trust that amendments so thoroughly in accord with the protective theory will prevail in the House. That the majority of the Republicans in the House will vote for such amendments we do not expect, but that one out of every eight Republicans in the House is a protectionist from principle, believes that the fostering of domestic trusts under the shelter of tariff duties is repugnant to the protective system, and will have the courage to express his convictions by his vote is not too much to hope, and if one out of every eight Republicans will vote with the Democrats and Populists for amendments stripping trusts and combinations of the shelter of tariff duties, such amendments will prevail.

In the discussion of the Dingley measure now being carried on in the House the purpose of a protective tariff as formulated by Hamilton, and as originally advanced and adhered to by the Republican party, seems to be largely lost sight of. The aim of a protective tariff was once understood by its supporters to be to encourage the development of our great natural resources, to foster domestic competition and thus free our people from dependence on foreign markets and so reduce prices paid by our people for manufactured goods to something near the cost of production, while securing to our people as producers a market near at home for their products and prices for their products something near the price paid by the consumer. But now the aim of a protective tariff seems to be understood by many of its supporters to be to protect domestic trusts and combinations from foreign competition and, under the shelter of tariff duties, to enable such trusts to exact prices for their products not warranted by the cost of production.

Such a tariff was never contemplated by Hamilton; such a perversion of the protective principle would have been as repugnant to him as it would have been to Jefferson and Madison, who accepted the protective principle on the ground that it was only through protection that we could obtain the theoretical advantages of free-trade, and that only by protecting our nascent industries from unnatural competition on the part of our European competitors, every ready to temporarily depress prices in order to undersell and crush out our rising industries, could we make possible the development of trade and industry in those natural channels that would prove of greatest advantage to our people, and confer the greatest strength on our nation.

To raise prices of protected articles to consumers, so that the producers of such articles may unduly profit at the consumers' expense, is not the end of the kind of protection taught by Hamilton and Carey, nor have our tariffs imposed on protective principles tended to a raising of prices. Through a building up of domestic competition, and the resulting breaking of the hold of foreign monopoly on our markets, they have resulted, in general, in reducing prices of the protected goods to our people. But when domestic monopoly steps in and takes the place of foreign monopoly, then this end of protection is brought to naught. We simply exchange masters, suffering the exactions of domestic monopoly, where before we suffered the exactions of foreign.

It is human nature for men to charge just as much as they can get for their goods, and so it is that we can count on men having a monopoly of a market to charge just as high prices as they can, without putting their goods beyond the reach of too great a number of their customers. Of course the price asked is determined by a calculation as to which will yield them greatest profit, a broader market at lower prices or a narrower market at higher prices. They will endeavor to hit upon the point that will yield greatest profit, never mind how much it may happen to be above the cost of production. If the sale of a thousand pounds of material at fifty cents a pound will yield greater profit

than the sale of 1,500 at forty cents, or 2,000 at thirty cents, the price will be kept at fifty cents, though the cost of production may be but half of that sum. But if the sale of 1,500 pounds at forty-five cents will yield greater profit than the sale of 1,000 pounds at fifty cents, and if the reduction to forty-five cents will result in such an enlargement in market, the reduction will be made. Such are the considerations the monopolist takes into account in fixing prices.

But when the field is open to free competition the price will fall to a point that will cover the cost of production and yield an average rate of profit to the producer, for so long as the price rules at a level that will yield more than average profits, men will be tempted to engage in that line of production, the output of goods will be increased, and the competition to find a market will result in putting down the price. And this will go on under natural conditions until the price falls to the cost of production plus an average rate of profits.

But the producer with a monopoly over a market will not give up the profits of monopoly if he can help it. An enterprising man, tempted by the large profits gathered by the monopoly, invests his capital in this line of production and commences to compete with the monopolist for the market. The producer who has had a monopoly sees his monopoly and the continuance of monopoly profits threatened. To keep his monopoly he must crush out competition. To do so he must undersell and ruin his competitor. This will cost him something, but he can well afford it if he can crush his competitor. So he enters into a war of cutting prices, and in this war his accumulations of capital give him a great advantage over his competitor. It is this advantage that he counts upon. He puts prices down, if need be, below the cost of production, his competitor must follow, and the monopolist has the accumulations to stand the loss, while the capital of his nascent competitor is limited. Temporarily the consumer reaps great advantage, he is enabled to buy at low prices, but the profit of the consumer is but temporary. He must pay the piper, for the war of prices bankrupts the competitor that threatened to break up the monopoly, the monopolist may buy up the new plant at wreckage prices or he may not, he may buy it and run it or let it go to ruin; but whatever he does he regains a monopoly over the market, he again gets in position to charge monopoly prices, and at once he sets about to recoup himself at the expense of the consumer by raising prices again to the level of monopoly.

Clearly it would have been to the benefit of the consumer if some one had stepped in and protected the nascent producer from the underselling of the monopolist. Prices would not then have fallen so rapidly, but the nascent competitor would not have been wiped out, and there would have been no return to monopoly prices. On the contrary, as the new industries became more firmly rooted, competition for the markets would grow and prices would fall. Now, this is just what we have striven to do through the medium of a protective tariff. We have protected our producers against the underselling of the foreign monopolist, built up domestic competition, and thus freed our consumers from foreign monopoly.

That foreign producers have all along competed among themselves in greater or lesser degree for our markets, and thus the intensity of monopoly been in a measure broken, is quite true, but over our producers these foreign producers have had a great advantage, an advantage not conferred by any natural advantages, but by the accumulations of capital at their command, which accumulations make weapons of inestimable value in a war of cut-throat competition. And it is here that our Government has stepped in, and by the imposition of tariff duties made it impossible for foreign manufacturers to effectually use these weapons, which if left free they would have used to crush out competition in America and maintain their monopoly over our markets.

To say that tariff duties result in enhancing prices to our consumers is therefore quite unfair. It is quite true that the prices at which foreign manufacturers now offer their goods for shipment to America are, in many cases, materially below the prices asked by our manufacturers, and that if it were not for the tariff tax these foreign goods could be sold in our markets at prices considerably below those now ruling. Building on this ground the free trader concludes that a tariff duty results in not only taxing the consumer by the amount of the duty collected and which finds its way into the Treasury, but in enhancing the price of all articles of home manufacture by an amount equivalent to the duty, and consequently taxes the consumer by forcing him to pay an added price equivalent to the rate of duty collected on foreign goods on all goods of domestic make, which tax goes into the pockets of the manufacturer. Thus, it is argued, a protective tariff duty taxes the consumer many-fold the amount of duty collected and paid into the Treasury, only the enhanced price paid by the consumer on goods of foreign make finding its way into the Treasury vaults, while the equally enhanced price paid by the consumer on all goods of domestic make finds its way into the pockets of the favored manufacturers.

Therefore, says the free trader, to put a tariff duty on the importation of any product that our people are engaged in producing works injustice; the just and equitable tariff should be levied only on those articles of consumption that we import in entirety from abroad. Put a tax on tea and coffee, and the price to the consumer will be enhanced, but the full measure of the enhancement will find its way into the National Treasury. Put a tax on woollens, the price will be enhanced and where one dollar collected from the consumer, because of the enhancement of the price finds its way into the Treasury, six or seven dollars will find their way into the pockets of the manufacturer. This is the argument of the free-trader.

But the truth is, a true protective tariff will not enhance the price of manufactured goods to our consumers, and the fact that the prices at which our foreign competitors now offer their products for shipment to America and at which they could be laid down in our markets if it were not for the tariff duties, are considerably below the prices now ruling, cannot be taken as proving that protection has enhanced prices to our consumers. If the protective tariff had not secured nascent industries against abnormal foreign underselling and enabled them to gain a footing, thus establishing domestic competition and breaking the control of the foreign manufacturer over our markets, who can say that these manufacturers would be offering their products at prices which, if it were not for the tariff duties, would make it possible to lay such products down in our markets at lower prices than those asked by our manufacturers? The prices asked by foreign manufacturers when through the building up of domestic competition their monopoly of our markets is broken are very different than the prices they would be asking if our consumers were still dependent upon them.

But aside from the breaking of foreign monopoly, a protective system should be aimed so as to confer one other great and general benefit. Encouraging the development of our resources and the building up of domestic industries, it leads to the diversification of industries. This brings consumer and producer nearer together, and the nearer producer and consumer can be brought the less expense will there be attached to the exchange of their products. Consequently, there will be less wasted energy, fewer hands engaged in the distribution of wealth, and, as a result, the tax resting on the producers of wealth will be lighter, and men will enjoy more nearly the full value of the fruits of their toil. In other words, the price received by the manufacturer for his goods will be nearer the price paid by the farmer, and the price received by the farmer for his products nearer the price paid by the consumer of farm products. And from this, manufacturer and farmer must gain, and the gain will be neither's

loss, for the manufacturer and farmer will both get more for their products, while neither pays more for the products of the other.

But when domestic trusts and combinations get control of certain lines of production, all that which should be gained from protective tariff duties and the building up of domestic competition is lost. Tariff duties built to foster domestic competition and keep down prices to the legitimate cost of production, lose their purpose when they are made the shelter of trusts and monopolies and should be repealed, for a tariff duty that fosters a domestic monopoly designed to repress competition and arbitrarily enhance prices, putting our consumers at the mercy of monopoly, builds up at home the very evils growing out of dependence and subserviency to foreign monopoly that a protective tariff is aimed to free us from. Yet the Dingley bill, purporting to be a protective measure, maintains, and even raises, the duties on articles the production of which is monopolized by trusts, and it gives no safeguard against the growth of trusts and combines under the shelter of tariff duties. The schedules of the pending bill should be amended so as to permit the importation of all articles the production of which is monopolized by trusts or combines, free of all duty save where a duty on the raw product entering into production is imposed, when a duty on the trust product commensurate with the duty paid by the trust on the importation of the raw materials should be imposed, but a duty higher than this should be imposed under no circumstances, and provision should be further made for the placing on the free list of any article now on the dutiable list, should the production of such article fall in the future into the hands of a trust or combine, organized to repress domestic competition.

Republicans should take in hand and press these amendments which are thoroughly in accord with the principle of protection. They cannot afford not to press such amendments, for the tariff as framed is a measure protective of special interests, protective of monopolies organized to repress competition and prey upon the community, not of the general weal, and if the protective system is to stand it must be cleared of such onus. It is the place of protectionists, not of free traders, to press these amendments, though free traders will welcome them. Not to press them is to stamp the Dingley tariff as class legislation, as the fosterer of trusts, not of domestic competition. Yet we fancy the majority of Republicans in the House are ready to stamp the bill as such, ready to avow themselves as protectionists not from principle but selfishness. But we do believe there can be found the votes in the Senate to amend the bill along these lines, and the needed twenty-five Republican votes in the House to secure the acceptance of the amendments by that body.

AN ANTI-TRUST AMENDMENT.

DEFENDERS of trusts and monopolies are few, yet the faultfinders with any legislation aiming to repress their growth and curtail their power are many. If a trust organized to artificially restrict production and repress competition is injurious, the duty of a just government is undeniably to overthrow it, and for a government—especially one that in theory knows no preferences, and holds all men entitled to the enjoyment of equal privileges and rights—to extend the protection of tariff duties to the trusts and combines that it should overthrow is subversive of all rules of good government. To foster the growth of trusts and combines that we profess to be anxious to destroy is indicative of bad faith, yet we find Congressmen who denounce industrial trusts stenuously opposing any reduction of tariff rates on articles monopolized by trusts, and even insisting that we raise the tariff duties behind which the trusts have taken shelter. It seems that the trusts have few open defenders, but numerous advocates who dare not avow themselves as such, but ready to work against anything antagonistic to the interest of the trusts.

That trusts and combines organized to repress competition

are injurious to the interest of the wage-earners they employ, to say nothing of other wage-earners, and injurious to the interests of our people as consumers, few will deny. So unanimous is the public verdict on this score that it is scarcely necessary to discuss the point. Their growth is universally deprecated. Yet taking into consideration the existing trade conditions, conditions that have been more or less chronic for a quarter of a century, their growth is not surprising. For nearly a generation the industrial world has had one constant struggle with falling prices, and with many the struggle has been an unavailing one. For a producer of wealth to prosper in the face of a sharp fall in prices is well nigh impossible. He cannot prosper unless his margin of profit is large enough to more than make good the loss suffered through depreciation of his property.

So it is not surprising that manufacturers, as other producers, have sought and seek around for some means of checking the fall in prices for their products. And means of checking this fall there are but two. Either the demand must be increased or the supply curtailed. Now, the means of increasing the demand for goods has been quite beyond the vision of the ordinary manufacturer, and so he has turned to the other alternative, that of curtailing the supply. But for one manufacturer to curtail the output of his mill without agreement with other manufacturers to do likewise would have been unavailing, for such restriction of production in the hope of raising prices would have simply deflected orders to other manufacturers with the result that curtailment of production on the part of one manufacturer would have been offset by the increased production of another. So manufacturers in different lines strove to come to an understanding with one another to restrict production.

But a mere understanding did not, in many instances, prove satisfactory, there being no way of forcing the different parties to the understanding to live up to their agreement. So the next step was in order, that of organizing into a trust. And then a vista of great profits opened before the organizers of these trusts. Pooling their resources the producers entering into these trusts found themselves possessed of a far-reaching power, a power to squeeze out competitors and then squeeze down wages and force up profits at the expense of the wage-earners and consumers. With a depth of pocket given by combination greater than that of the independent producers outside the trust, they saw the way clear to crush out these competitors. So by temporary and often localized underselling they set about to drive these competitors to the wall. Those that they found strong they took into partnership, those who had not deep pockets out of which to make good losses entailed by cut-throat competition they pursued relentlessly until they drove them into bankruptcy. And having bankrupted these weaker competitors they set about buying up their property at wreckage prices and recouping themselves for temporary losses by raising prices. This is the course that many trusts have worked out, that many others are following.

And once possessed of virtual monopoly they have set about restricting production and taken advantage of the tariff duties to raise prices above the prices ruling in Europe, to a degree equivalent to the tariff duty and freight charges. In short, they have raised prices just as far as they could without inviting foreign competition. Thus they have made the tariff duties designed to stimulate domestic competition and keep prices down to a point measured by the cost of production, the shelter for raising prices; they have added the tariff duty to the price asked for their products and made use of such duties to swell their own profits at the expense of consumers.

And meanwhile they have made use of the artificial restriction of production to cut wages. Restricting production they have been enabled to lay off hands, and as these idle hands seek ever for re-employment, and become ready to work for lower and lower wages the longer they are kept in enforced idleness, the trusts make for themselves the weapon to force down wages. The

idle army seeking work makes it possible to say to the employed: Accept a reduction in wages or make place for one of the idle, clamorous and anxious to work for the reduced rate we offer. And so wages are forced down, the cost of production is reduced, but the trust does not put down prices commensurately. It may not put down prices at all. Having a monopoly of the market, being free from competition, it does not have to. It can say to the consumer, pay my price or go without, just as it can say to the wage-earner, work for what I offer or seek work elsewhere.

Moreover, it is not only the wage-earners directly employed by the trusts who are injurious affected by a restriction in production. As we have said, every restriction in production adds to the army of unemployed, and this army tramps the highways of the nation seeking work. Thus it is that every workman feels the stress of competition for his place, every employer feels his ability to fill the place of present workmen with workmen at lower wages, and so he is ever inclined to cut wages. So it is that the trusts are injurious in that they depress wages, a depression that is not reflected in the prices paid by consumers for trust products; they are injurious to consumers in that they keep prices higher than warranted by the cost of production. What is more, they keep prices higher than they could if not sheltered from foreign competition by tariff duties, higher than they could if they had not squeezed out the domestic competition that protective duties are imposed to foster, for if there were domestic competition the price could not be held above the cost of production inclusive of a fair rate of profit to the producer.

And tariff duties built to encourage domestic competition having been made the shelter of trusts and combines organized to repress competition and defeat the very purpose of a protective tariff, the elimination of such tariff imposts as are protective of articles monopolized by trusts is demanded. The question is not only to remove the duties from articles the production of which is now monopolized by trusts and combines, but how to provide against protective duties being made the shelter of trusts and combines that may be formed in the future. Evidently this must be provided for by some general amendment, and it is such an amendment that Senator Pettigrew has outlined and proposes to offer to the tariff bill at the proper time.

Such an amendment must be framed so as to provide for the free entry of goods now on the dutiable list, or, in cases where a duty is placed on the importation of the raw material, on the payment of a duty equivalent to the rate of duty collected on the raw materials, whenever it shall be found that the production of such goods has fallen into the hands of a trust or combine organized to repress domestic competition, and calculated to defeat the ends of the protective system. The repeal or reduction of duties should then turn on a question of fact, the question being whether or no a trust or combine controlling the specific article in dispute is existant. But who is to determine this question of fact? Naturally the United States courts, and to the United States courts Senator Pettigrew would refer all such questions of fact. The court affirming that a trust or combine was existant and controlling production, then such affirmation would be equivalent to the repeal or reduction of the tariff rates imposed on the article, the production of which had passed under the control of monopoly. But whom can we entrust to bring these questions of fact to the attention of the courts? Obviously the interested parties, the importers, who will not pay customs duties the payment of which they can avoid, and who would be impelled by self-interest to gather proof of the formation of trusts and combines, and appeal to the courts, on this score, for release from the payment of customs duties on their importations.

This brings us to the prime question, What is to be considered a trust or combine, and by what rule are the courts to be guided in the rendering of their decisions? This rule must be laid down by Congress. It must be a rule sharp and easily determinable. It lays with Congress to say what is to be considered

as constituting a trust or combine. This is a point that must not be involved; the definition of what is to be considered a trust and combine subversive of the protective principle must be incapable of different interpretations, its meaning must be so clear as to be unmistakable. To throw the duty on the courts of determining when a trust or combine is organized to repress competition and when it is injurious to the public weal would make the work of the courts so complicated as to defeat the purposes of the amendment. It seems to us that the one question for the courts to be called upon to decide is what proportion of the product has fallen under the control or regulation of a trust or combine. If more than a certain proportion of the product is so controlled then let a trust or combine be considered to be existant, far reaching enough in its grasp and control of the markets to warrant the repeal or reduction of customs duties. This is a question that should be quite readily ascertainable.

Now, supposing that the control of one-half of the production of any article by a trust or combine, corporation, or group of men, be made the rule for the guidance of the courts in determining the suspension of customs duties, let us see how such an amendment to the tariff law as outlined above would work. A trust or combine being formed and taking shelter behind our tariff laws to raise prices, the annulling of such protective duties would be in order. To secure an annulment of these duties some district court of the United States would have to be petitioned for relief and proof would have to be brought showing that such trust or combine produced, controlled or regulated one-half or more of the total product. If such proof were conclusive then the court would be obliged to issue an order directing the customs officers of the United States to permit the importation of the article in question free of duty, or, if a duty on the importation of the raw product was imposed, then on the payment of a duty equivalent to the rate of duty collected on the raw material. Thus the Dingley bill contemplates a duty on raw sugar testing 75 degrees, that is, sugar containing 75 per cent. of saccharine matter, of one cent a pound and on refined sugar of $1\frac{3}{4}$ cents a pound or \$1.875 per hundred pounds. Now, if to make this 100 pounds of refined sugar it takes 133 pounds of raw sugar paying a duty of one cent a pound, the equivalent rate of duty on refined sugar would be $1\frac{3}{4}$ cents a pound, and it would be at approximately this rate that refined sugar could be imported under the Dingley bill if passed with Senator Pettigrew's amendment, for the sugar trust, admittedly refining 85 per cent. of the sugar refined in the United States would promptly be declared by the courts to be a trust not entitled to the benefits of protection.

The men petitioning the courts for relief from the payment of duties on the plea that trusts and combines are restricting production would be undoubtedly the importers. The court petitioned for the suspension of duties would issue an order to that effect returnable in due time. Then the importer would submit proof of the existence of a trust or combine, and the other interested parties would have the opportunity to show cause why the order should not be granted. The court would then weigh the evidence, and if it appeared that the production of more than one-half of our product of the article in question was controlled by a trust or combine, the court would issue an order directing customs officers to permit the importation of such article free of all duty, or, if it happened to be an article manufactured out of raw materials paying tariff duties, upon the payment of duties equivalent to the rate of duty paid on the raw products, what this differential rate would come to being calculated by the customs officers.

The adoption of an amendment of the scope proposed by Senator Pettigrew, and as we have outlined, would deprive trusts and combines, organized to repress domestic competition and exact an undue tribute from wage-earners on one side and consumers on the other, of all tariff protection, and the protective system would thus be freed of the onus of sheltering

trusts and combines. Such an amendment should find ready acceptance among Republicans, for it would purify the protective system which aims to build up domestic competition and free our people from the grasp of foreign monopoly. The suppression of domestic competition, the defeat of the very end of protection, and the building up of domestic monopoly under the shelter of tariff duties is a perversion of the protective principle, and it should be recognized as such by the Republican party. We do not expect it will be, for the Republican party has turned its back on principle, but we are hopeful that the principle of true protection will be recognized in the new tariff, by the acceptance of Senator Pettigrew's anti-trust amendment, despite the opposition of the majority of Republicans.

TARIFF RECIPROCITY AND OUR MERCHANT MARINE.

TO seek new markets for our products, especially when the seeking be in the direction of countries of a different latitude and climate than our own, and producing products that do not, and for the most part cannot, come into competition with the products of our own people, is ever laudable, and the efforts making by Mr. Dingley in the direction of securing reciprocal trade relations with the countries to the south of us stand out in his tariff bill as commendable among much that is not. But in striving after new markets it is well not to over-rate their importance and under-rate the value of our home markets. Our home markets are worth ten South American markets to our manufacturers. Our own people are capable of absorbing annually (if we can rely on our census figures), ten times the quantity of manufactured goods yearly imported by the countries to the south of us from all the countries of the world, and this being the case, it is of much greater importance to build up our home market than open new markets in South America.

But to the fostering of our home market through the building up of agricultural prosperity, Mr. Dingley gives little attention; to the opening up of new markets in South America he gives much. By relieving our farmers from the competition stimulated by the premium on gold in all silver and paper-using countries, and securing to our farmers and planters better prices for their products, the Republican party could do more for our manufacturers than can be accomplished by the making of any number of reciprocal arrangements. But we are bound in the direction of refusing our manufactures the greater benefit and tendering the lesser. The true cause of the failing in demand for manufactured goods is ignored—indeed the very failing in demand is ignored and manufacturing depression attributed to the flooding of our markets with goods of foreign make, and a new outlet for the products of our mills is sought in South America when the real need of our manufacturers is the conserving of our home markets.

But though the South American markets are of incomparably lesser importance to our manufacturers than our home markets, and though calculations of manufacturing prosperity based on the opening up of new markets to the south of us, rather than on the conserving of our own markets, are bound to lead to disappointment, still there is no occasion to sneer at the importance of these foreign markets or the efforts to secure a footing for our manufactured products in those markets. We buy very freely of the products of the countries to the south of us, and they do not do well by us in return. We buy freely of the coffee, the sugar, the hides, these countries have for sale, but while looking to us for a market for a large part of their products, they ignore us in their purchases of manufactured goods, looking to Europe rather than to us. Thus it happens, that during the fiscal year 1896, we bought of South American countries, products of the value of \$108,828,462, while we bought of the West Indian Islands, Mexico and the states of Central America, \$85,665,126 worth of products, or a total value of importations from the countries to

the south of us, of \$194,493,588. And during the same year we sold to South American countries goods of the value of but \$36,297,671, and to the West Indian Islands, Mexico and Central America, goods of the value of \$55,481,036, or a total of but \$91,778,707.

Thus it appears that we bought over \$100,000,000 more of produce from the countries to the south of us than we sold to them. For this excess we made payment not by remittance to South America, but by drafts on London. In other words, the countries to the south of us made use of the balance owing them by us to pay their indebtedness, or a part of their indebtedness in Europe, incurred on account of their purchases of goods of European manufacture and the accruing of interest charges on their debt to Europe. Thus a triangular trade has been set up between Europe, South America and the United States, Europe selling manufactured goods to South America in excess of purchases, South America selling to the United States largely in excess of her purchases of our products, and the United States selling cotton, food and other products to Europe largely in excess of purchases of European goods.

Now, this triangular trade Mr. Dingley would put an end to by imposing duties on importations of coffee and hides, and an extra duty on sugar coming from countries refusing to extend concessions on exports of the United States, and thus forcing the countries to the south of us into reciprocal arrangements such as would give our manufacturers a preference in their markets. In short, it is suggested that we say to our southern neighbors, if you want to sell us your sugar and coffee and hides, you must buy our manufactures; if you want free entry for your coffee and hides into the United States and reduced rates on your sugar, you must make equivalent concessions to exports of the United States, you must impose a lower range of duties on importations from the United States than you do from other countries. Now, this is fair enough, and there is no question the countries to the south of us would enter into such reciprocal arrangements. One doing so the others would have to follow or rest under a serious handicap. Moreover, the extending of such reciprocal arrangements would unquestionably lead to an increase in our exports of manufactured articles to the countries to the south of us.

But the part played by the British merchant marine and the want of a merchant marine of our own in the building up of the triangular trade that Mr. Dingley would undo by reciprocal arrangements seems to be overlooked. The advantage of cheap freight rates to South American countries possessed by the British manufacturers are inestimable, and have proved quite sufficient to build up this triangular trade. If we would pull it down, we should put our manufacturers in possession of the same advantages, and this we can only do by building up a merchant marine of our own.

The British ship carries manufactured good to South America often at almost nominal rates, for the profitable part of the voyage is in the carriage of South American products to the United States, and our products to the United Kingdom. Britain buys very much more from us than she sells to us, and besides, the products she buys are much more bulky and take more ships to carry than the products she sells. Consequently, it takes more ships to carry American products to England than it takes to carry British products to America. British ship owners engaged in importing American produce must, therefore, return many of their ships to America in ballast, or seek out some triangular trade by which this may be avoided. And so comes in the keen competition over freights to South America, a cargo from South America to the United being readily obtainable.

These cheap freight rates have been a great advantage to British manufacturers in securing a hold on the South American markets, and it is clear that the building up of an American merchant marine, and the establishment of direct lines of steamers between the United States and South America would be a great

boon to our manufacturers in extending the markets for their goods, for the establishment of such lines of steamers would be followed by a cheapening of freight charges.

How, then, may we build up a merchant marine? The Republican party is pledged to bring this about by the imposition of discriminating duties on goods imported into the United States in foreign vessels, and Mr. Elkins has introduced, in the Senate, a bill providing for the imposition of such duties at the rate of 10 per cent. This measure does not seem, however, to be recognized as a party measure. If it is, the whole plan of Republican legislation is very illy considered, for the Dingley tariff bill aims to make good any deficiency in revenues, and here is another measure that incidentally, and for the first year or two at least, would yield not less than \$50,000,000 of revenue. The revenue yield from this source would undoubtedly fall off rapidly as an American marine was built up and the importations in foreign bottoms fell off, but on a basis of importations for the fiscal year 1896 the Elkins bill would have yielded a revenue of \$62,689,052, and on a basis of importations for the fiscal year 1895 a revenue of \$59,053,836. Now, if any such revenue as this is to be turned into the Treasury during the next year or two, there is no need of passing the Dingley tariff measure to provide for the deficit in revenues. But there are some men who seem to think it an advantageous thing to contract our currency by piling up money in the Treasury, and we believe Mr. Dingley to be one of them. The passage of both the Elkins and Dingley bills would serve excellently to promote this end.

But the prime purpose of the Elkins bill is to build up an ocean marine of our own, not to raise revenue. That such a measure would be most effectual in the building up of a merchant marine cannot be doubted. Foreign vessels could not compete with our own for our import trade when importations in foreign bottoms were discriminated against by the imposition of an extra duty equal to ten per cent. of the value of the cargo. Such a discrimination would increase the cost of importation in foreign bottoms by ten per cent., and to secure any share of our import trade foreign vessels would have to do the work for a charge lower than the charge of American ships equivalent to ten per cent. of the value of the cargo. And as the average freight rates on our imports do not now exceed ten per cent. of the value of the cargoes it will be seen the advantage of the American ship owner would be enormous. Such a discriminating duty would, in effect, be equivalent to a bounty of 100 per cent, enjoyed by our ship owners over their competitors, and under such a bounty the replacing of the foreign merchant marine in our import trade by a merchant marine of our own, would be carried on with a rapidity limited only by the capacity of our ship yards.

It is said the great ship owning nations would retaliate by placing discriminating duties on importations in American bottoms, but could they afford to do so and would our position be a losing one if they did? In the first place, by discriminating against importations in American bottoms the great ship owning nations, and England especially, would be the great losers from their own discriminations; in the second place, such discriminations would not seriously hamper the growth of our merchant marine and the development of our foreign trade, for the nations which are our natural customers and with which we can trade most advantageously would not discriminate against us, for they have no merchant marine of their own. We speak of the nations to the south of us. Now, the immediate result of the imposition of discriminating duties on imports in foreign bottoms would be to make a great demand for American vessels in the ports to the south of us to carry products northwards. On the northward voyage our ships could reap great profits, for they would have a great advantage over their competitors, and the prospect of earning these northward freights would in itself be sufficient to cause American ships to seek ports to the south of us. But they would not want to go empty in search of their profitable return

cargoes. Rather than go in ballast they would accept cargoes at merely nominal rates and thus would be held out to our manufacturers the great advantage of cheap freights.

And while our manufacturers enjoyed this boon the British manufacturer would lose the same boon, for British ships sailing to South America, and no longer being able to find remunerative return cargoes by way of America, would have to reimburse themselves for the deprivation of these profits by charging higher freights on the outward cargoes of manufactured goods from Europe to South America. The result would be our trade with the countries to the south of us would flourish while British trade languished.

And now as to our trade with Great Britain, the greatest ocean carrier of the world. Suppose she retaliated by discriminating against importations in American ships. The result would be simply to raise the freights her manufacturers would have to pay on everything exported to America, and to enhance the cost of American breadstuffs to the British consumer. It may be urged that this enhancement of price would cause Britain to turn elsewhere for her supplies. But she would find the same causes working to enhance the cost of breadstuffs wherever she turned. The enhancement in the price of breadstuffs bought in America would arise from the fact that British vessels could not find cargoes, save at nominal prices, to take to the United States, for importations in British bottoms would have to pay the discriminating duty of ten per cent. Consequently on the westward voyage they would earn practically nothing. They would have to make up by charging double freights on the eastward voyage. This increase of freights the British consumer would have to pay, and so his food would cost him more. And this enhanced cost he could not escape. If he turned to Argentine or Russia, presuming these countries had the surplus grain to sell, he would have to send his ships for it in ballast, and so he would have to make up on the return cargoes, just as he would have to in our case. So discrimination against imports in American ships would only serve to shut the British manufacturer out of our markets and raise the price of food products to the British consumer.

And the effect upon us of such discrimination would be far from baneful. It would raise the freights on importations of foreign goods in American bottoms by forcing American vessels to sail eastward empty, but this raising of freights, which would act as additional protection against foreign competition, has more terrors for the foreign manufacturer than for us.

The objection to the Elkins' bill is not that it would fail of its purpose, or that the accomplishment of its aim, the building up of an American marine, is not desirable. Indeed it would accomplish more than its direct purpose. It would lead to the opening up of new markets. The objection is that the measure is ill considered in that it is but a part, and a detached and minor part, of the comprehensive plan of protection for all classes, farmers, wage-earners, manufacturers, miners, ship-owners, that is needed to restore prosperity; it is objectionable in that it would raise revenue that is not needed, and lead to a piling up of money in the Treasury, and consequent contraction of our currency that needs must be injurious to trade and industry.

It is well to build up an ocean marine of our own that would be a source of national wealth and strength, but let us build up our other depressed industries at the same time. It is more important to lift the crushing burdens off the backs of our farmers, our manufacturers and our wage-earners, and enable these great producing classes to extricate themselves from the rut of stagnation and impoverishment than it is to build up an ocean marine. We can better, and with greater profit, turn to the rebuilding of our ocean marine after we have put our farmers and planters on the road to prosperity than we can before. We can prosper without a merchant marine, we cannot prosper unless the toil of our farmers and planters is remunerative, and the building up of a

merchant marine cannot make our agricultural classes prosperous. It will be wise to eradicate the root of industrial depression before trying superficial remedies for our ills. We can never reach the highroad of national prosperity by administering stimulants to trade while sapping our industrial vitality. This should not be forgotten by the supporters of the Elkins bill.

WOMAN'S WAYS.

THERE are loyal hearts, there are spirits brave,
There are souls that are pure and true!
Then give to the world the best you have,
And the best will come back to you.

Give love, and love to your life will flow,
A strength in your utmost need;
Have faith, and a score of hearts will show
Their faith in your word and deed.

Give truth, and your gifts will be paid in kind,
And honor will honor meet.
And a smile that is sweet will surely find
A smile that is just as sweet!

Give pity and sorrow to those who mourn;
You will gather, in flowers again,
The scattered seeds from your thought outborne,
Though the sowing seemed but vain.

For life is the mirror of king and slave,
'Tis just what we are and do.
Then give to the world the best you have,
And the best will come back to you.

—Madeline S. Bridges.

A very trustful woman believes in her lover's fidelity with her heart; a very vain woman believes in it with her head.

It is a mighty good thing to be frank in this world, to be honest with one's self and with the people. They like it, and respect a woman more for it.

Because a woman engages in different meetings and the work of societies gotten together in the interest of the advancement of the public weal, or more particularly of woman, is no excuse whatever for her to neglect her children. A woman who neglects her babe for the public will find in the future the great mistake she has made, and that her work has been to no purpose.

A society at Shanghai, headed by two English women, recently drew up a petition to the Emperor begging him to forbid the cruel custom of footbinding. The petition never reached the Emperor, but the officials returned the answer that as no one was compelled to follow the custom the government could not interfere with it.

Queen Elizabeth, a most shrewd and prudent sovereign for the days in which she lived, when holding important councils, with Embassadors from other countries, brought not only all her learning and sagacity to bear against them, but used every little feminine art at her command to win them to her service. In short, she relied on her womanliness to conquer where statecraft was of no avail.

The feminine domestic diplomat is a person of unlimited tact and good sense. She has what not to do reduced to a science, and above all she is attractive. It is observed:

That she never describes her aches and pains.

That she never dwells on unpleasant reminiscences.

That she never apologizes for the food.

That she is never a martyr.

That she never corrects the children in the presence of any person, even the family.

That disorder of a temporary nature does not visibly disturb her.

That when the family diatribe threatens she knows how and when to deftly change the subject.

That she gets rid of a guest who bores her by simply folding up a newspaper, and the other never suspects.

That she lets everyone have affairs of their own.

That she is always polite and cordial to the children's friends.

That she never communicates any news before dinner.

That she never divulges her methods.

A WORD WITH THE DOCTOR.

Hemorrhages of the lungs or stomach are often checked by small doses of salt.

.

A warning has been voiced by one of the leading English medical journals in regard to the too-frequent use of the Roentgen ray apparatus. It is interesting, no doubt, to obtain a series of photographs of one's own skeleton, but, if this is to be at the expense of such trifles as one's hair and one's finger-nails, it seems hardly worth the cost. One electrical engineer, who has often demonstrated the beauty of his own finger bones by placing one of his hands within the radius of the searching rays, has lost all the nails from the fingers of that hand, while Mr. Sidney Rowland, who is one of the leading experimenters in that direction, mentions several cases of similar character in the structural changes that occur in the hair, and so forth, of those who have been frequently shadowgraphed by this method.

Thus, in the case of patients whose heads have been subjected to the influence of the rays, the hair has either turned white or has fallen out entirely. It is suggested that these results are due to the electrical potency of what are called the ultra violet rays of the spectrum, though their precise action is at present by no means thoroughly understood.

.

For hiccoughs drink half a glass of water containing one tablespoonful of vinegar and a teaspoonful of salt.

.

The most recent scientific authorities are of the opinion that malaria is a water-born disease. In vast malarial districts, it is not the air which the inhabitants breathe, but the water they drink, which brings on the much-dreaded malarial fever. That this is the case in some sections of the land has been clearly proved by the immunity from fever of such families as depended on filtered rain-water, and not on the wells of the country.

It has also been noted that horses and other animals, brought into certain sections of the country, thrived well so long as they were housed and drank from the cistern supply of the barns, but sickened and died when left to wander in the fields, and drink from brooks and pools. If this should be clearly proven, it might be possible to stamp out one of the greatest evils of life in some sections of the country.

It is not a difficult matter to collect the rainwater in a clean cistern. It should be passed through a filtering medium that is frequently renewed, as it is now known that a filter too long in use becomes one of the most effective means of contaminating the water it is intended to purify. The filter that is clogged up with impurities is far worse than none at all, and this is the condition of a great many cistern filters.

As an extra precaution, even the cistern water ought to be boiled, poured in a clean earthen jar and cooled in a pure atmosphere. The ice formed from contaminated water is almost as objectionable as the unclean water itself, as a large number of bacteria are undisturbed by frost. Such a jar of boiled water should be daily renewed, as if it is left standing any length of time it will soon take on the same objectionable features as the water of the country.

.

Neuralgia of the feet and limbs can be cured by bathing night and morning with salt and water as hot as can be borne. After bathing rub the feet briskly with a coarse towel.

.

When coughing at night is particularly troublesome, the thorough warming of the bed, previous to its being occupied, will often avert an attack. Persons with consumption or heart disease will secure untold comfort and many restful nights if they always go to warm beds to seek repose. To old people, with no particular ailment, what bliss for them to miss the cold and chill and feel the grateful warmth! And for the little tots also, especially those who are inclined to be "croupy," this careful warming of the bed may prevent restlessness and coughing at night.

One of the nicest ways to warm a bed is by ironing the lower sheet, and as much of the upper one as is thrown back when the bed is opened. After this is done, quickly draw up the bed clothing and place bottles of hot water or the old-fashioned warmed log or bricks in between the ironed sheets.

"CHRISTIANITY AND IDEALISM."

AUTHOR TO REVIEWER.

We are favored with the following letter from the Rev. Dr. Watson, upon our recent notice of his book:

"I have not much faith in the virtue of replies to criticisms in the press, and I have never before, since the publication of my 'Kant and his English Critics' in 1881, on any occasion replied to criticisms of my books. The review is very 'smart' indeed, but it is not of such a character as to deserve any reply, and it is only with a view to your readers that I make one. I should have thought that the function of a reviewer was to give his readers some idea of the contents of the book he was reviewing. This my critic has not done. He calls my little effort, which was intended as a popular exposition of a certain way of thinking that I believe to be sound and to be of great value in solving certain perplexities on the subject of religion which many feel—he speaks of it in a lofty way as 'amateur philosophizing.' But why should this instructed critic speak of 'amateur philosophizing' at all? If philosophy is a 'helpless cripple' even the speculations of Plato, Aristotle, Kant and the other masters can only be the 'helpless' movements of 'cripples!' What can we say to such a view except that it is hopelessly unreasonable? And when he goes on to say that 'literary criticism is at least a substantial thing,' he is evidently unaware that he has contradicted himself. What is 'literary criticism' but unmethodical philosophy? I am further informed that I do not make clear what I mean by the 'Christian Ideal.' As I have devoted a whole chapter to that subject, I must be a very obscure writer indeed, if the charge is true. I venture to say that your readers will find no obscurity in my statement if they take the trouble to read what I have said. But in truth the whole review exhibits nothing but petulance and impatience, and an arrogant dogmatism, which is the worst enemy of truth. Writers of this type are always sure to tell us that 'the whole title of metaphysical crutch-makers (as he politely terms all who have faith in the need of philosophy), 'mistake a life for a theory.' We do nothing of the kind. We are perfectly clear that 'life is more than thought,' but we also see that without thought man's 'life' would be all the poorer. What are the theological speculations of Christian thinkers in all ages, including such names as Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Melancthon and Calvin, but attempts to comprehend the religious consciousness and express its contents in a systematic form? What, then, does the writer mean by his flippant references to philosophy? It is men like him who do the most serious damage to the cause of religion. I am quite willing that your readers should judge between us. Any one with even an ordinary acquaintance with theology, not to speak of philosophy, will at once see that, when I speak of my attempt to 'reconcile the freedom and individuality of man with the fundamental principle of Idealism, that the actual, properly understood, is a manifestation in various degree of our self-conscious and self-determining spiritual Being,' I am only stating in philosophical terminology the problem of the reconciliation of human freedom, with the infinity of God. I may have failed to solve the problem as better men have done before me, but at least it is a problem worthy of the highest powers of man. It is my critic's opinion that I only succeed in 'confounding the already sufficiently confused.' It may be so, but at least I have done my best, and I am content to leave the matter to less prejudiced readers than my clever reviewer."

JOHN WATSON.

Queen's University, Kingston, Canada,
15th March, 1897.

Free Stop-over at Washington.

On all through tickets between the East, West, North and South, reading via Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, a stop-over at Washington can be secured without extra charge for railroad fare, by depositing the ticket, upon arrival at Washington, with the B. & O. station ticket agent at that point. Washington is always attractive to visitors, and particularly so while Congress is in session. This arrangement for stop-over privilege will doubtless be appreciated by the public, and will bring to the National Capital many travelers to view its superb public buildings, monuments, museums and thoroughfares.—*Adv.*

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE MIDDLE PERIOD, 1817-1858. American History Series.
John W. Burgess. New York: Charles Scribner's
Sons. \$1.75.

Adequately to review so compact a work as this, upon so profound and delicate a historical controversy as that which still rages around the question of slavery, would require a volume of equal size, from a pen equal in range and force with the author's. As this is out of question, the proper thing to do is to place the subject, the treatment of it, and the book fairly before the reader that he may know the direction in which the author seeks to take him, withholding suggestions of guidance which in less grave matters fall within the literary province to make. The author, who is professor of political science and constitutional law in Columbia University, New York, frankly announces that he does not write from the standpoint of either the sentimentalist or the party man. He claims to view the question as an impartial investigator of facts in the cold light of constitutional law. In this lies the almost unique title of the book to the respect of all serious students of national development, a fast growing body, whose glory it is to subordinate prejudice to the higher patriotism. So many of our histories have the trail of the serpent disfiguring otherwise admirable attempts at chronicling the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. This is not an isolated work, and may not be judged as such. It forms the fourth volume in a connected series of five, covering our history from 1492, the period preceding that dealt with by Prof. Burgess being the years 1783-1817, ably treated by the late Francis A. Walker under the title "The Making of the Nation." It is the policy as well as duty of the conscientious author of a book of this importance to set up a clear understanding between himself and his two classes of readers as to what he is going to do with them, or, rather, what he is going to do with the bunch of facts which they look at from opposite or different sides. In such a case the preface is perhaps the most important part of the book, and we shall not be disappointed if we turn to Prof. Burgess's outspoken statement for words that inspire confidence and stimulate the appetite for the substantial fare he provides. He feels the gravity of pronouncing unbiassed judgment on the stormy decades before the war. He half doubts his right to undertake the task—an imperative one it seems to him—of dispelling "the continued misunderstanding . . . which is an ever-present menace to the welfare of both sections and of the entire nation."

He says, "My early years were embittered by the political hatreds which then prevailed. I learned before my majority to regard secession as an abomination, and its chief cause, slavery, as a great evil; and I cannot say that these feelings have been much modified, if any at all, by longer experience and maturer thought. I have, therefore, undertaken this work with many misgivings. Keenly conscious of my own prejudices, I have exerted my imagination to the utmost to create a picture in my own mind of the environment of those who held the opposite opinion upon these fundamental subjects, and to appreciate the processes of their reasoning under the influences of their own particular situation. And I have with sedulous care avoided all the histories written immediately after the close of the great contest of arms, and all rehearsals of them of later date. In fact, I have made it an invariable rule to use no secondary material; that is, no material in which original matter is mingled with somebody's interpretation of its meaning. If, therefore, the facts in my narration are twisted by prejudices and preconceptions, I think I can assure my readers that they have suffered only one twist. I have also endeavored to approach my subject in a reverent spirit, and to deal with the characters who made our history, in this almost tragic period, as serious and sincere men having a most perplexing and momentous problem to solve, a problem not of their own making, but a fatal inheritance from their predecessors."

"I have been especially repelled by the flippant superficiality of the foreign critics of this period of our history, and their evident delight in representing the professions and teachings of the 'Free Republic' as canting hypocrisy. It has seemed to me a great misfortune that the present generation, and future generations, should be taught to regard so lightly the earnest efforts of wise, true and honorable men to rescue the country from the great catastrophe which, for so long, impended over it. The passionate one-sidedness of our own writers is hardly more harmful, and is certainly less repulsive."

The author vindicates the right of the North to form impartial judgment on this chapter of history, as follows:

"My opinion is, that this history must be written by an American and a Northerner, and from the Northern point of view—because an American best understands Americans, after all; because the victorious party can be and will be more liberal, generous and sympathetic than the vanquished; and because the Northern view is, in the main, the correct view. It will not improve matters to concede that the South had right and the North might, or, even, that both were equally right and equally wrong. Such a doctrine can only work injury to both, and more injury to the South than to the North. Chewing the bitter cud of fancied wrong produces both spiritual misery and material adversity, and tempts to foolish and reckless action for

righting imagined injustice. Moreover, any such doctrine is false, and acquiescence in it, however kindly meant, is weak, and can have no other effect than the perpetuation of error and misunderstanding."

From these extracts it will be seen that the five hundred pages are packed with solid matter, very lucidly arranged and treated with briskness occasionally bordering on the racy. There is a good index, besides a chronology, a copious bibliography, colored maps, and a statistical appendix. As showing the author's livelier style and his strong convictions we quote, without comment, the closing passage of his book. Speaking of the struggle in Kansas, he says:

"Error began, unquestionably, with the repeal of the Act prohibiting slavery in the Louisiana territory above thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes North latitude, and wrong began, just as unquestionably, with the incursion of the Missourians, and their fraudulent voting at the territorial election in March, 1855. A bogus legislature was thrust upon Kansas Territory at the outset. It was a political outrage of the first degree, and it would have justified rebellion against the execution of the enactments of this body. But it does not excuse, or even palliate, the criminal atrocities inaugurated by John Brown at Dutch Henry's Crossing, and the wild reign of murder and robbery which followed in their train. All this was common crime of the blackest and most villainous sort, and the men who engaged in it were cut-throats and highwaymen, who took advantage of the confusion in Kansas to prosecute their nefarious work."

"It is often said that the Civil War began in Kansas, and simply spread from there over the country. It is true that violence began there, and in its degeneration into savagery developed those devilish dispositions that carried murder and robbery into Virginia, and thereby helped mightily to create that intensely hostile feeling between the North and South which resulted in Civil War, but we affront good morals and common sense when we dignify those Kansas atrocities by the title of war; and we obliterate moral distinctions when we attempt to justify them by the end which their authors professed to have in view, the extermination of African slavery throughout the country. Such deeds are not means to anything except the establishment of the reign of hell on earth, and the maudlin adoration sometimes accorded their doers is evidence of an unbalanced moral sense. It is a source of congratulation that the juristic sense of the last decades of the nineteenth century refuses to place the crank who kills or robs for what he considers, or professes to consider, the welfare of society under any other class than that of the most dangerous criminals. It remains for the ethical sense of the twentieth century to sweep the hero-worship too often accorded such characters out of the world's literature."

A CHILD-WORLD. By James Whitcomb Riley. Indianapolis:
The Bowen-Merrill Co. \$1.25.

When no less an authority than Mr. W. D. Howells repeatedly speaks of Mr. Riley as a "poet," and declares "I do not know why one should not frankly place him with Lowell as equally master in dialect verse," we rub our eyes and scan more seriously the pages filled with what we had mistaken for doggerel. True, Mr. Howells only said this in certain chatty newspaper talks, the friendly lift one Ohio man may give to another, and Lowell was some years dead. The minor history of our literature, major and minor, sparkles with reputations that came as comets come, and so depart. Especially poetical reputations. A happy song, a quaint dialect piece, a bit of sheer jingle that catches the ear and gets no further, such effusions as these have often been hailed as the bubblings of genius until the wintry morrow has classed them among the babblings of geese. And, again, there are waif poems, born in the corner of some obscure paper and wafted mysteriously into poetry books across the ocean, fated to scrape through life as children of the celebrated "Anon," or wrongly affiliated, that by their thrill and beauty surpass many a "popular" piece by famous singers. Two such orphaned offsprings of genius that greatly impressed the present writer long ago, credited to Sir Walter Raleigh and John Milton in the poetry books, were within the last few years discovered to belong to two American women, little known even in their own land. Such are the ups and downs, especially the latter, of the literary life. There is little danger of anything in this "Child-World" book living to be mistaken for the productions of either Milton or Raleigh, Mrs. Lavinia Stoddard or Mrs. Howell. That Riley has penned some "pretty," homely verses, that may recall Bloomfield's "Farmer's Boy" is readily admitted. We can try to join Mr. W. D. Howells in fancying that "no poet has shown such a passion for the homely and humble things of life," but it will be a very trying try and will end in failure. The book is one of the familiar village epics, spun out of all natural proportion to fill out a volume. It suggests some distant imitation of Longfellow's "Tales of a Wayside Inn," but is farther behind him than he is behind Burns or the "Cotter's Saturday Night" is behind "The Deserted Village." Another friendly lift by an Ohio critic accompanies that by Mr. Howells, to direct our feeble powers in rightly estimating this production of the poet Riley, and it boldly puts his name one notch higher than Pope's, as Riley has "transformed the couplet as Pope employed it," into "an easy and natural" beauty peculiar, we may hope, to the

Wanamaker's.

Oil-Cloth and Linoleum THERE'S a charm in wide selection. Think of it, there are two hundred and thirty-three styles of the new floor oil-cloths and linoleums, 25c. to \$1.50 a square yard.

And Inlaid Linoleum—the figures and coloring go clear through, so that the beauty is almost as enduring as tile. Twenty five patterns fresh from England. \$1.25 and \$1.50 square yard. The best American Linoleums are here, too.

Printed and plain Linoleums—4 qualities—50c. to \$1.00 a square yard. They run from 2 to 4 yards in width. 75 styles.

Oil Cloth, 3 to 18 feet wide, 25c. to \$1.25 a square yard. 125 styles.

Third Floor, Market street.

Awnings BEST time to order awnings. All the stuffs are here to choose from. Plenty of time now to do the work—and we're hard at it already. The awnings will be delivered whenever you say.

Second Floor, Thirteenth street side

Natural Plants WE have set a new pace in plant selling—put newly little prices on them and sell hundreds instead of dozens. Hurt the market? Not a bit of it. But it multiplies the number who will buy and enjoy these smiles of Nature.

Azaleas, \$1.50 to \$3.75.

Genestas, \$1.50.

Fan Palms, \$1, \$1.50 and \$2.

A few Dwarf Palms at \$1 and \$1.50.

Cross Aisle, Thirteenth Street.

JOHN WANAMAKER.

Why You Should Have It.

Bimetallism or

The Evils of Gold Monometallism and the Benefits of Bimetallism, * * *

By WHARTON BARKER.

It discusses in every phase the most vital question of the day.

It is an exhaustive and conclusive work.

It is the clearest, fairest, most logical book ever written on bimetallism.

It presents facts and gives arguments based on proven facts to demonstrate why gold monometallism drives all producers to ruin and despair.

It shows why and how bimetallism will bring back general and lasting prosperity.

It is a book which will always have a distinct value of its own.

By all those best fitted to judge, it is admitted to be without an equal.

Only when you have read it can you appreciate why all this and much more is true. And you will find it to your advantage to do this at once, therefore send for a copy now.

Sent postpaid to any address on receipt of price.

Paper bound edition, - - \$.50
Library Edition, Cloth, - - 1.00

A limited number of slightly shop-worn copies—paper edition—are being sold at half price, 25 cents a copy. For all purposes as good as though fresh from the press.

BARKER PUBLISHING Co.,

119 South Fourth St.,

PHILADELPHIA.

Please mention The American.

Parnassian slopes of Ohio. Where Riley attempts blank verse it is very, very blank, and where he out-soars Pope he makes us very, very sore. That there may be no suspicion of bias, we take these specimens of the spirit and body of Riley's new poetry book from his friends before-named, who cite them as the best beauties. Mr. Howells quotes these strictly prose lines, cut into rhyme-line lengths, with the edifying announcement that "No one else has conceived so truly, so kindly, of children, or has been able to tell us so sweetly what they are."

The Child-heart is so strange a little thing—
So mild—so timorously shy and small—
When grown-up hearts throb it goes scampering
Behind the wall, nor dares peer out at all!—
It is the veriest mouse
That hides in any house—
So wild a little thing is any Child-heart!

Child-heart! mild heart!—
Ho, my little wild heart!
Come up here to me out o' the dark,
Or let me come to you!

Mr. Nicholson follows suit with this "transformed" couplet as illustrating "Mr. Riley at his best."

Filling the sehse with zestful rumors of
The dear, old-fashioned dinners children love.

We are content to accept him at this best, without adducing the few score of gems we discovered in wading through the dismal swamp of verse "executed with neatness and dispatch" to order, instead of waiting for inspiration. Poetry is harder to find than such rhymes as these: Paradise, surprise; orchard birds, afterwards; once, months; of, love; sufficed, realized. The word "unctious" is evidently Ohioese for unctuous. A good many blank verse lines end in "the," "of," "at," etc. Put forward on its simple merits a Riley rhyme book would receive the kindest treatment. He should pray to be saved from his fool-friends.

A PURITAN BOHEMIA. By Margaret Sherwood. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$.75

The Bohemia of a quiet little out-of-the-way New England town must be a new thing in this well-worked vein. Living ghosts in the guise of artists flit through its thoroughfares with mysterious black bags in their hands, and this raises visions of weird possibilities. Artists in any Bohemia are sure to be wicked, less or more, in the eye of the average novelist, but this is not an average novel, if so short a story can be rightly classed as a novel. Not much romance can be expected in a place "as quiet as a motionless pool at the side of a moving stream, where frail old ladies with nodding curls, and men with hair like white spun silk go tremulously by, wondering at the queer life of this secluded spot."

ABOUT BOOKS AND WRITERS.

A bit of news which will cheer the hearts of many long-suffering bookbuyers comes from New York. The far-famed army of Book Canvassers has gone on strike, at least those who belong to the Mutual Protective Association. Here is a chance for economizing in these hard times. The canvasser is by many supposed to be a mere salesman of goods, as many doubtless are, but there are others of a superior calibre, who know as much of the insides of books as the outsides. Last year more than one canvasser made \$5,000 in the year with a single book, and as much as \$300 have been earned in a single week. Several well-known canvassers have been over thirty years in the business. They fare better than the authors.

* * *

The Century Club, of New York, has excluded the New York *World* and *Journal* from its files. This is still more welcome news than the foregoing paragraph. Were it not for its idiotic inanity the "Yellow kid," vulgarism of these papers would call for no special remark, but it is evident that brains are going out of fashion with a larger section of the community than was suspected. When papers with big circulations and consequent wealth make it their boast that each outdoes the other in glorifying slum life, there is something radically wrong in the mental make-up of those who buy and read them. Yet it is only a degree worse than the more widespread adoration of Mammon in Bradley-Martin balls. Why do self-respecting people advertise in papers unfit to lie on the family breakfast table?

TWO HEARTS
ONE THOUGHT

COLUMBIA



BICYCLE

Columbia Bicycles
\$100 TO ALL ALIKE.
Standard of the World.
POPE MFG. CO., Hartford, Conn.
Catalogue free from dealers or by mail for one 2-cent stamp.

1897 KEATING BICYCLES

Tasty Design,
Improvements,
Skilled Workmanship,
are all Visible

Interested? If so, send
your address to

KEATING WHEEL CO.

821 Arch St.

PHILA.

or Factory, Middletown, Ct.

RAYMOND & WHITCOMB'S TOURS.

ALL TRAVELING EXPENSES INCLUDED.

Parties will leave Philadelphia April 20 for Grand and Comprehensive Tours (personally escorted throughout) to

**COLORADO,
CALIFORNIA,
THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST,
ALASKA**

AND
THE YELLOWSTONE PARK.
The Wonderland of America.

Alaska (omitting California) May 27.
Yellowstone National Park Tours, June 4,
July 15 and 29.
European Tours, March 27, May 4, 15, 18, June
9 and 26.
Independent Railroad and Steamship
Tickets to all points.
Send for descriptive book, mentioning the
particular trip desired.

RAYMOND & WHITCOMB,
1005 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.
Please mention The American.

We see kidnapping frequently spelt "kidnaping" in the newspapers. There is no iron rule for spelling, but there is a golden one, which bids us observe common-sense consistency as much as possible. This is a free country for all, but he would be a bold editor who could print Poe's lines thus:

"While I noded, nearly naping,
Suddenly there came a taping,
As of someone gently raping
Raping at my chamber door,
Only this and nothing more."

"Tom" Paine was a longer-headed and better-hearted man, and a truer patriot, than prejudice has cared to admit. So far from being an atheist, his religious views as a deist would be thought quite antediluvian by most of our advanced ethical culturists, Jew and Gentile. He was often coarse and sometimes irreverent, as have been many famous reformers, from Luther to Huxley, but his political writings were as sound as they were brilliant and brave. The Revolution owed more to Paine than to a good many of its better-rewarded heroes. Moncure Conway's biography and edition of Paine's works is admittedly a handsome reparation of the injustice meted out to a real force in our history at its first crisis. If it be insulting to write of the President as "Bill" McKinley, it is not less so to take this liberty with "Tom" Paine.

The chief mouthpiece of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America is the *Churchman*, whose owner and editor, the Rev. Dr. Mallory, died a few weeks ago. The wealthiest clergyman in the same body was the late Rev. Dr. Hoffman. Very curious it seems, but true, that Dr. Mallory was at one time the proprietor-manager of the Madison Square theatre, and Dr. Hoffman, late rector of St. Michael and All Angels Church, was, with his surviving brother, the Dean of the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary, proprietor of the Hoffman House hotel, with its notorious bar, the rendezvous of New York sporting men.

Twenty years ago England was invaded by *Harper's Magazine*, which secured a large circulation by giving the then wonderful new Waterbury watch as a premium on its three dollar subscription. The *Detroit Free Press* ran a penny weekly edition in London, and a few copies of the *Herald* and *Tribune* were bought by journalists. This was about the extent of the invasion. Now the United States is flooded with American editions, printed here from the second-hand English plates, of London periodicals of almost every sort, and Christmas illustrated numbers sell here by the half million. The reciprocity is getting too one-sided.

F. A. Davis, Edward Bailey, and John P. Nicholson have been appointed receivers of the F. A. Davis Company, of Philadelphia, publishers and sellers of medical books. The liabilities are said to be about \$300,000. By continuing the business it is expected that the greater part of the indebtedness, if not all, can be met eventually.

Grant Allen, himself a better scientist than novelist, submits these appreciations of Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer, which merit respectful consideration:

"If I were to sum up the positions of these two great thinkers, Darwin and Spencer, the experimentalist and generalizer, the observer and the philosopher, in a single paragraph each, I should be tempted to do it in somewhat the following fashion:

"Darwin came at a moment when human thought was trembling on the verge of a new flight toward undiscovered regions. Kant and Laplace and Murchison and Lyell had already applied the evolutionary idea to the genesis of suns and systems, of continents and mountains. Lamarck had already suggested the notion that similar conceptions might be equally applied to the genesis of plant and animal species. . . . Darwin presented himself at the exact right moment—a deeply learned and well-equipped biological scholar, a minute specialist as compared with Spencer, a broad generalizer as compared with the botanists, entomologists and ornithologists of his time. He filled the gap. As regards thinkers he gave them a key which helped them to understand organic evolution; as regards the world at large, he supplied them with a codex which convinced them at once of its historical truth."

"Herbert Spencer is a philosopher of a wider range. All

knowledge is his province. A believer in organic evolution before Darwin published his epoch-making work, he accepted at once Darwin's useful idea, and incorporated it as a minor part in its fitting place in his own system. But that system itself, alike in its conception and its inception, was both independent of and anterior to Darwin's first pronouncement. It certainly covered a vast world of thought which Darwin never even attempted to enter. To Herbert Spencer, Darwin was even as Kant, Laplace, and Lyell—a laborer in a special field who produced results which fell at once into their proper order in his wider synthesis. As sculptors, they carved out shapely stones, from which he, as architect, built his majestic fabric. The total philosophic concept of evolution as a cosmical process—one and continuous, from nebula to man, from star to soul, from atom to society—we owe to Herbert Spencer himself, and to him alone, using as material the final results of innumerable preceding workers and thinkers."

The *Cincinnati Enquirer* makes a funny experiment. Assuming that eye-labor would be saved if, instead of beginning at the left end of every line, we zig-zag forward and backward alternately, it presents the following example:

"Spurgeon used
ex tempore in students his practice to
preaching from a text only disclosed in the
on men young his of one that and pulpit,
reaching the desk and opening the note con-
'Zac- word single the read text his taining
cheus.' He thought for a minute or two
'Zaccheus thus: himself delivered then and
was a little man, so am I; Zaccheus made
suited He 'I did so down, came and haste
the action to the word."

"Modern Irish Poets" is to be published in Dublin and Belfast, and among the verse-makers are included Mr. Lecky, M. P., Prof. Dowden, Dr. John Todhunter, the Rev. M. Russell, S. J.

La Grippe's Deadly Foe.

"For months that dread and decimating disease known as La Grippe has been almost epidemic on this Peninsula. From all sections come reports of its ravages, and its victims can be counted by the hundreds. Never before has it been known to prevail to such an alarming extent or to be so serious in its character. In scores of instances it has been but the forerunner of its twin brother, pneumonia, and the latter has almost universally resulted fatally. The death list since January 1st has been alarmingly increased from this source alone.

"Many remedies have been tried to counteract the effect of these twin diseases with varying results, but from all who have tried it we hear that the Compound Oxygen treatment of Drs. Starkey and Palen has been successful wherever adopted. This remedy is rapidly growing in favor, and its virtues acknowledged. In several well authenticated cases it has been known not only to relieve, but to absolutely cure consumption. Drs. Starkey and Palen are located at 1529 Arch street, Philadelphia, and they gladly furnish all information regarding their treatment free. Write them."

—Sussex Countian, Laurel, Del.

THE KEY NOTE:

SUBSTITUTE

HONEST MONEY FOR FICTITIOUS CREDIT.

This book, written by Albert Griffin, of Topeka, Kansas, better known as an earnest worker in the cause of Temperance, is a presentation of the financial question which will appeal to all thinking people. It shows that

HONEST MONEY

is that money which neither cheats creditors nor robs debtors. It points out the abuses of our existing banking system, which enables unscrupulous men to use the funds of depositors, entrusted to them for safekeeping, as a basis for

BANK CREDITS

which they expand and contract to the great injury and often ruin of honest men engaged in legitimate business operations. It shows how financial and commercial panics may be and are thus deliberately engineered by men who seek to profit from the misfortunes they force upon others, and proposes a plan to overcome and prevent the evil.

Sent postpaid to any address on receipt of price.

Paper bound edition - - \$.25
Cloth " " - - .50

Publishers of

THE KEY NOTE.

P. O. Box 1202,

PHILADELPHIA.

(brother of the Lord Chief Justice), Miss Jane Barlow, Miss Katherine Tynan, and Mr. Aubrey de Vere.

Mr. Lang is eloquent over *The Compleat Angler*. The book in its original form is one which only the wealthy collector can hope, with luck, to call his own. A small actavo originally sold at 36 cents is now worth \$2,175. Izaak's *Compleat Angler* may be said to have been fished out of existence, because it was always carried in the fisherman's pocket, and the angler often fell in the water.


NOTES AND QUERIES FOR THOSE WHO TRAVEL.

THE FLOATING VILLAGES ON THE LOWER HUDSON. From the month of April to the month of December one may hardly ever take a steamboat trip up or down the Hudson River without passing one of those big canal-boat tows dragging slowly and heavily along the wide stretch of water in the wake of a more distant paddle-wheel steamboat. Sometimes these tows, five or six boats abreast, and stretching away half a mile in length, look like a floating town with long lines of level decks for streets, and squat awning-covered cabins with little shining windows and bright green blinds for the houses; sometimes they appear like little clustered villages or hamlets of heavy barges, with a scattering population of a few dozen men, women and children to give life to each.

To reach the humanity that is the real heart of all the picturesque scene one must become a citizen of that drifting town—an inhabitant of a floating home, like the other floating homes that make up the transient community that clings together for thirty odd hours of voyage it takes to run from New York to Albany. For the good simple people are very ready to respond to any advances made toward acquaintanceship, and one soon becomes intimate with one's neighbors, visiting across the decks, and perhaps down into the cabin home. The little narrow space is always immaculately clean. There are nearly always flowers in the little curtained window, and the easy rocking-chair is briskly dusted for the visitor. If one stays long enough with them and shows sufficient interest in their affairs, the captain and his wife will talk very freely about themselves—of their simple hopes and aspirations; of the pleasures and sorrows they have to look back upon. It is thus when one comes to know them as they are that they cease to be a mere remote and picturesque aggregation, and become individual human entities of real warm flesh and blood.

IDEAL TOURING TO THE PACIFIC COAST. Of Messrs. Raymond & Whitcomb's many tours to the Pacific Coast in the past seventeen years, none has been more popular than the annual spring sight-seeing trips which are personally conducted throughout, and which afford unsurpassed opportunities to view the wonderful scenic sections of the middle and western parts of America. The tours this year will have Tuesday, April 20, as the date of leaving Philadelphia. One party will include not only Colorado and California, but also the Pacific Northwest, Alaska, and the Yellowstone National Park. Another will follow the same magnificent round, omitting Alaska. A third will go no farther than California. Colorado, with its beautiful mountain and cañon scenery, will be included in all. A special descriptive book may be obtained of Messrs. Raymond & Whitcomb, 1005 Chestnut st., Philadelphia.

SOME DELIGHTS OF MOUNTAINEERING. The inhabitants of Capetown frequently get a considerable amount of excitement out of attempts to scale the heights of Table Mountain by new routes. During the Christmas holidays two brothers had a perilous experience. After an ascent, during which they risked life and limb, they greatly enjoyed the flora and scenery on the summit, and then proceeded through rushes and braken, only to arrive at the edge of a precipice 3000 feet deep. Growing desperate, they tried to descend at another point. Down they went, at times holding to bushes, at others literally sliding down a slightly slanting rock, and at other times clutching hold of a corner of a projecting rock with their hands and making similar use of their feet. At one juncture the younger brother, who was ahead, scrambled down an almost perpendicular rock of fully twenty feet, though the elder, profiting from the warning of the one in front, managed to get round. After this the descent for some distance was comparatively easy; but suddenly they recognized that they could get no further. There was nothing for it but to climb back, a distance of 2000 feet. This they did, struck the Mountain Club path, and eventually reached Capetown in a state of exhaustion.



NO-TO-BAC

BRINGS REWARD

Her Sweetest Kisses are yours when you have cast away the stinking pipe, the vile cigar, the deadly cigarette, the filthy chew, have taken

NO-TO-BAC

and been restored to that wonderful magnetism of life, which makes your loved one tremble with delight. Nicotine steals away your manly vigor. Take NO-TO-BAC and learn the full enjoyment of life. There's absolutely no excuse for your not being cured of the tobacco habit if you want to be, for No-To-Bac is sold by all druggists, under an absolute guarantee to cure or money refunded. If you want to try No-To-Bac before you buy, write us, and we'll gladly send you our booklet and a sample free.

Address: STERLING REMEDY CO., CHICAGO; MONTREAL, CAN.; NEW YORK, 230

If You Are Not

you should be a subscriber to *The Patriots' Bulletin*, edited by W. H. HARVEY, author of *Coin's Financial School*. It is a monthly journal published at the storm center of political events: heralds to its friends the movements of the enemy, and fearlessly defends the people against the encroachments of the money power. The price of subscription is only 25 cents a year. Address COIN PUBLISHING CO., 362 Washington Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.



BOUND VOLUMES OF THE AMERICAN.

A very limited number, each covering 6 months, for years 1895 and 1896, are offered at \$2.50 per volume, express prepaid. If any particular volume is desired, please specify which. Orders must be subject to prior sale.

THE AMERICAN
P. O. Box 1202, Philadelphia.

Brown's Skirt Fastener

Our "T" does it.



WITHOUT

is not made of metal. By its use the most stylish dress is made as comfortable as a house gown. No aching back, no open vents, no sagging skirts. Ask your merchant or dressmaker to show it to you.

... Manufactured by ...



WITH

BROWN'S SKIRT FASTENER CO.

S. E. Cor. Second and Spruce Streets,

Philadelphia, Pa.

THOMAS MEEHAN & SONS

NURSERYMEN AND LANDSCAPE ENGINEERS

Church and Chew Sts. TELEPHONE 9411-A. Germantown, PHILADELPHIA

ORNAMENTAL TREES, SHRUBS AND FRUITS
of every description. Catalogue Free.
GRADING, ROADMAKING AND DRAINING
PLANS PREPARED
for Grading or Planting and carefully carried out.